IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventors:	Cary J. Hoffer, et al.	Examiner: Melur Ramakrishnaiah
Serial No.:	10/733,033	Group Art Unit: 2614
Filed:	December 11, 2003	Docket No.: 200312174-1
Title:	A Video Conference System with a Camera Disposed in a Computer	

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Appeal Brief is filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed April 17, 2008 and Notice of Appeal filed on July 17, 2008.

AUTHORIZATION TO DEBIT ACCOUNT

It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's deposit account no. 08-2025.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is Hewlett-Packard Development Company, LP, a limited partnership established under the laws of the State of Texas and having a principal place of business at 20555 S.H. 249 Houston, TX 77070, U.S.A. (hereinafter "HPDC" or "Appellants"). HPDC is a Texas limited partnership and is a wholly-owned affiliate of Hewlett-Packard Company, a Delaware Corporation, headquartered in Palo Alto, CA. The general or managing partner of HPDC is HPQ Holdings, LLC.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no known related appeals, judicial proceedings, or interferences known to appellant, the appellant's legal representative, or assignee that will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Appeal Board's decision in the pending appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1 – 19 are pending in the application and stand finally rejected. Claim 20 was canceled. The rejection of claims 1 – 19 is appealed.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments were made after receipt of the Final Office Action. All amendments have been entered.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The following provides a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings by reference characters, as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v). Each element of the claims is identified by a corresponding reference to the specification and drawings where applicable. Note that the citation to passages in the specification and drawings for each claim element does not imply that the limitations from the specification and drawings should be read into the corresponding claim element or that these are the sole sources in the specification supporting the claim features.

Claim 1

A portable computer (Figs. 1 and 2 show a portable computer #100), comprising:

a base portion (Figs. 1 and 2, #104) with a keyboard (Figs. 1 and 2, #122: see p. 3, paragraph [0016] at lines1-3; and p. 3, paragraph [0018] at lines 1-2);

an electronic display (Figs. 1 and 2, #102) connected to the base portion (see p. 3, paragraph [0016] at line 2); and

a camera (Figs. 1-4, #160) stored in the base portion of the portable computer, wherein the camera automatically powers on as the camera is ejected from the base portion of the portable computer (Preferably, the camera is in a power-off mode while positioned in the cavity 150 in the storage position. Once the camera moves from the storage position to the ejected position, the camera automatically actuates to a power-on mode. In this regard, an electronic switch 167 can be provided in the cavity 150. When the camera is ejected, the switch 167 can activate the camera to power-on: see p. 5, paragraph [0024] at lines 1-6.).

Claim 2

The portable computer of claim 1 wherein the camera automatically powers off when inserted into the base portion (Further, when the camera is positioned into the storage position, the switch 167 can activate the camera to power-off. When the camera 160 is pushed into the base portion 104, the switch 167 automatically activates the

camera into the power-off mode (i.e., shuts the camera off: p. 5, paragraph [0024] at lines 6-10.).

Claim 10

A method, comprising:

automatically powering a camera on while ejecting the camera from inside a cavity located in a computer (Preferably, the camera is in a power-off mode while positioned in the cavity 150 in the storage position. Once the camera moves from the storage position to the ejected position, the camera automatically actuates to a power-on mode. In this regard, an electronic switch 167 can be provided in the cavity 150. When the camera is ejected, the switch 167 can activate the camera to power-on: see p. 5, paragraph [0024] at lines 1-6.); and

automatically powering the camera off while inserting the camera into the cavity of the computer (Further, when the camera is positioned into the storage position, the switch 167 can activate the camera to power-off. When the camera 160 is pushed into the base portion 104, the switch 167 automatically activates the camera into the power-off mode (i.e., shuts the camera off: p. 5, paragraph [0024] at lines 6-10.).

Claim 15

A video conference system (As shown in Figs. 1-7, the camera 160 and the portable electronic device 100 comprise a multi-media system to perform video conferencing: p. 9, paragraph [0040] at lines 1-3.), comprising:

a computer (Figs. 1-7, #100; p. 3, paragraph [0016] at line 1.); and

a camera (Figs. 1-7, #100) movable between a first position and a second position (The camera is movable from a first position or storage position received within the cavity 150 of base portion 104 (as shown in FIG. 1) to a second position or ejected position (as shown in FIG. 2): p. 4, line 2 of paragraph [0022] to p. 5, line 1 of paragraph [0022].), wherein the camera is enclosed inside the computer in the first position and is ejected to be mechanically detached from the computer in the second position, the camera being electrically coupled to the computer in the second position (Looking to FIG. 7, the camera 160 is unattached from the mounting member 170 (see FIG. 3) and can freely

move in any direction: p. 8, paragraph [0038] at lines 1-2.), wherein the camera is in a power-off state while enclosed inside the computer in the first position and automatically transitions to a power-on state as the camera is ejected and physically moves from the first position inside the computer to the second position being mechanically detached from the computer (Preferably, the camera is in a power-off mode while positioned in the cavity 150 in the storage position. Once the camera moves from the storage position to the ejected position, the camera automatically actuates to a power-on mode. In this regard, an electronic switch 167 can be provided in the cavity 150. When the camera is ejected, the switch 167 can activate the camera to power-on: see p. 5, paragraph [0024] at lines 1-6. As shown in FIG. 7, the camera 160 is mechanically unattached to the portable electronic device 100: p. 8, paragraph [0038] at lines 1-2.).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claims 1-4, 5-9, 11-13 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,525,932 (Ohnishi) in view of USPN 6,285,833 (Yamane).

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnishi in view of Yamane and US 2003/0112325 (Boyden).

Claim 15-18 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,587,151 (Cipolla) in view of USPN 5,691,766 (Murata).

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cipolla in view of Murata and Boyden.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnishi in view of Yamane.

VII. ARGUMENT

The rejection of claims 1 – 19 is improper, and Appellants respectfully request reversal of these rejections.

The claims do not stand or fall together. Instead, Appellants present separate arguments for various claims. Each of these arguments is separately argued below and presented with separate headings and sub-heading as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii).

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 112

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is traversed.

The examiner argues that the following recitations of claim 15 have no support in the specification and contain subject matter not described in the specification to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention:

> wherein the camera is in a power-off state while enclosed inside the computer in the first position and automatically transitions to a power-on state as the camera is ejected and physically moves from the first position inside the computer to the second position being mechanically detached from the computer.

Appellants strongly disagree. The specification and drawings clearly explain and show that a switch is used to transition the camera from a power-off state to a power-on state as the camera is being ejected from the portable electronic device. As explained in the specification:

> Preferably, the camera is in a power-off mode while positioned in the cavity 150 in the storage position. Once the camera moves from the storage position to the ejected position, the camera automatically actuates to a power-on mode. In this regard, an electronic switch 167 can be

> provided in the cavity 150. When the camera is ejected, the switch 167 can activate the camera to power-on… When the camera is pushed and ejected out of the base portion 104, the switch 167 automatically activates the camera into the power-on mode (i.e., turns the camera on). Thus, a separate on/off switch on the camera or on the portable electronic device 100, for example, does not have to be manually activated by a user to turn power the camera "on" and "off." (See p. 5, paragraph [0024]: portion omitted for brevity).

Paragraph [0025] even provides examples of switches that can be used to automatically power the camera on when the camera is ejected. Figure 2 shows an example of a switch at #167.

Clearly, one skilled in the art would read the specification and review the drawings to determine that a switch is used to transition the camera from a power-off state to a power-on state as the camera is being ejected from the portable electronic device.

Appellants respectfully ask the BPAI to reverse the rejection under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 5-9, 11-13 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,525,932 (Ohnishi) in view of USPN 6,285,833 (Yamane). These rejections are traversed.

Claims 1-4, 5-9, 11-13 recite one or more elements that are not taught or suggested in Ohnishi in view of Yamane. These missing elements show that the differences between the combined teachings in the art and the recitations in the claims are great. As such, the pending claims are <u>not</u> a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art. Examples are provided below for different sub-headings which are separately argued.

Sub-Heading: Independent Claim 1

As one example, independent claim 1 recites that the camera automatically powers on as the camera is ejected from the base portion of the portable computer. The Examiner admits that Ohnishi does not teach this element (see final OA mailed 04/17/2008 at p. 3). Appellants agree with this admission. The Examiner, however, attempts to cure this deficiency with Yamane. Appellants respectfully disagree.

Yamane teaches a camera that uses a single mechanism to control both the pop-up flash and the main power of the camera (see Yamane at col. 3, lines 22-24). A switch located inside the camera actuates upon movement of the pop-up flash. When the switch is activated, the main power of the camera turns on.

In contrast to Yamane, claim 1 recites that the camera automatically powers on "as the camera is ejected from the base portion of the portable computer." The camera in Yamane is not ejected from a base portion of a portable computer. Power to the camera in Yamane is not activated upon ejection of the camera. Instead, power to the camera in Yamane is activated when a pop-up flash on the camera itself is pushed.

Ohnishi and Yamane do not teach or suggest the claim recitation that a camera automatically powers as the camera is ejected from the base portion of the portable computer. Again, Yamane teaches that the camera powers on when a user pushes a flash pop-up, not as the camera is ejected from another device (i.e., a portable computer).

The differences between the claims and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, claims 1-4, 5-9, 11-13 are allowable over the art of record.

Sub-Heading: Dependent Claim 2

Dependent claim 2 recites that the camera automatically powers off when inserted into the base portion. The Examiner admits that Ohnishi does not teach this element (see final OA mailed 04/17/2008 at p. 3). Appellants agree with this admission. The Examiner, however, attempts to cure this deficiency with Yamane. Appellants respectfully disagree.

Yamane teaches a camera that uses a single mechanism to control both the pop-up flash and the main power of the camera (see Yamane at col. 3, lines 22-24). A switch located inside the camera actuates upon movement of the pop-up flash. When the switch is activated, the main power of the camera turns off.

In contrast to Yamane, claim 2 recites that the camera automatically powers off "when inserted into the base portion." The camera in Yamane is not inserted into a base portion of a portable computer. Power to the camera in Yamane is not de-activated upon ejection of the camera. Instead, power is de-activated when a pop-up flash on the camera itself is pushed.

Ohnishi and Yamane do not teach or suggest the claim recitation that a camera automatically powers off when inserted into the base portion. Again, Yamane teaches that the camera powers off when a user pushes a flash pop-up, not as the camera is inserted into another device (i.e., a portable computer).

The differences between the claims and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, dependent claim 2 is allowable over the art of record.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnishi in view of Yamane and US 2003/0112325 (Boyden). This rejection is traversed.

As explained above, Ohnishi in view of Yamane fails to teach or suggest all elements of independent claim 1. Boyden fails to cure these deficiencies. Thus for at least the reasons given with respect to independent claim 1, dependent claim 14 is allowable over Ohnishi in view of Yamane and Boyden.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 15-18 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,587,151 (Cipolla) in view of USPN 5,691,766 (Murata). These rejections are traversed.

Claim 15-18 recite one or more elements that are not taught or suggested in Cipolla in view of Murata. These missing elements show that the differences between the combined teachings in the art and the recitations in the claims are great. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Sub-Heading: Independent Claim 15

As one example, independent claim 15 recites the camera is in a power-off state while enclosed inside the computer in the first position and automatically transitions to a power-on state as the camera is ejected and physically moves from the first position inside the computer to the second position being mechanically detached from the computer. The Examiner admits that Cipolla does not teach this element (see final OA mailed 04/17/2008 at p. 8). Appellants agree with this admission. The Examiner, however, attempts to cure this deficiency with Murata and cites Fig. 9 and column 4, lines 25-38. Appellants respectfully disagree.

Figure 9 in Murata shows a video camera with a built-in video light. Column 4, lines 25-38 in Murata teaches that this built-in video light turns off when the light is stowed in the camera and turns on when the light is in use.

In contrast to Murata, claim 15 recites that the camera is in a power-off state while enclosed inside the computer in the first position and automatically transitions to a power-on state as the camera is ejected and physically moves from the first position inside the computer to the second position being mechanically detached from the computer. Importantly, the camera in Murata is not transitioning from a power-off state to a power-on state. Instead, a built-in light transitions from the power-off to the power-on state.

Furthermore, in Murata, the built-in light is moving, not the camera. Specifically, a detection means in Murata detects the position of the built-in light. In other words, Murata teaches detecting movement of a light. By contrast, claim 15 recites that the camera (not a light in the camera) "physically moves from the first position inside the computer to the second position being mechanically detached from the computer."

As yet a further difference, power to the camera in Murata is not activated. Instead, Murata is activating power to a built-in light, not the camera itself. In Murata, the video camera is already on when the built-in light is activated.

The differences between the claims and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, claims 15-18 are allowable over the art of record.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cipolla in view of Murata and Boyden. This rejection is traversed.

As explained above, Cipolla in view of Murata fails to teach or suggest all elements of independent claim 15. Boyden fails to cure these deficiencies. Thus for at least the reasons given with respect to independent claim 15, dependent claim 17 is allowable over Cipolla in view of Murata and Boyden.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnishi in view of Yamane. This rejection is traversed.

Claim 10 recites one or more elements that are not taught or suggested in Ohnishi in view of Yamane. These missing elements show that the differences between the combined teachings in the art and the recitations in the claims are great. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As one example, claim 10 recites automatically powering a camera on while ejecting the camera from inside a cavity located in a computer, and automatically powering the camera off while inserting the camera into the cavity of the computer. Ohnishi in view of Yamane do not teach or suggest these elements.

As noted above, Yamane teaches powering a camera when a user pushes the flash pop-up. Yamane does not suggest automatically powering a camera on while ejecting the camera from inside a cavity located in a computer or automatically powering the camera off while inserting the camera into the cavity of the computer.

The differences between the claims and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 10 and its dependent claims are allowable over Ohnishi in view of Yamane.

Factors/Rationale Do Not Support Obviousness Ohnishi in view of Yamane

In determining obviousness, neither the particular motivation to make the claimed invention nor the problem the inventor is solving controls. The proper analysis is whether the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art after consideration of all the facts. Further, although the Supreme Court in KSR cautioned against an overly rigid application of the teaching-suggestion-motivation (TSM) rationale, the Supreme Court recognized that TSM was one of a number of valid rationales that could be used to determine obviousness.

Appellants discuss examples of rationale or factors below to show that there is no finding of obviousness for Ohnishi in view of Yamane.

As a first factor, Appellants respectfully submit that no teaching or suggestion exists to make the combination because the references are directed to completely different inventions. Ohnishi (in US classification 361/686) is directed to a portable computer that stores peripheral equipment. For example Figs. 4 and 5 in Ohnishi show a portable computer storing a camera. **By contrast, Yamane teaches a completely different and unrelated invention.** Yamane (in US classification 396/177) is directed to a camera having a pop-up flash. When a user presses the flash and pops it up, the camera powers on.

As a second factor, Ohnishi and Yamane would have to be greatly modified to arrive at the claimed invention. Ohnishi is directed to computer that houses a camera. Yamane teaches that a camera turns on when a user presses and pops-out the flash. Assuming that Yamane's camera is positioned into a bay of Ohnishi's computer, ejection of the camera would not power-on the camera. A user would still be required to push the flash on the camera to activate or power-on the camera. Further, the detection switch in Yamane would not be in communication with the computer in Ohnishi.

As a third factor, the differences between the claims and the applied references are great. Examples are provided above with respect to various claims and are not reiterated here.

As a fourth factor, the Examiner is performing an improper piecemeal construction that uses hindsight to arrive at the claim elements. In other words, the Examiner is picking and choosing unrelated and isolated sentences or teachings from Ohnishi and Yamane with hindsight of Appellants' invention to allegedly obviate the pending claims. One cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

As a fifth factor, Appellant argues that no teaching or suggestion exists to make the combination because the references are directed to solving completely different problems. As discussed in the background section, Ohnishi is directed to problems associated with enhancing or expanding the use of portable electronic devices (for example, using the bays of a notebook computer). By contrast, the background section in Yamane teaches problems associated with having various switches on the body of a camera.

These various factors show that elements in the claims are not obvious in view of the Ohnishi and Yamane.

Factors/Rationale Do Not Support Obviousness Cipolla in view of Murata

In determining obviousness, neither the particular motivation to make the claimed invention nor the problem the inventor is solving controls. The proper analysis is whether the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art after consideration of all the facts. Further, although the Supreme Court in KSR cautioned against an overly rigid application of the teaching-suggestion-motivation (TSM) rationale, the Supreme Court recognized that TSM was one of a number of valid rationales that could be used to determine obviousness.

Appellants discuss examples of rationale or factors below to show that there is no finding of obviousness for Cipolla in view of Murata.

As a first factor, Appellants respectfully submit that no teaching or suggestion exists to make the combination because the references are directed to completely different inventions. Cipolla is directed to a portable computer that includes an integrated video camera. The camera is stored in a cavity of the portable computer. **By contrast, Murata teaches a completely different and unrelated invention.** Murata is directed to a video camera that has a built-in light. This light turns on when it moves from a stowed position.

As a second factor, Cipolla and Murata would have to be greatly modified to arrive at the claimed invention. Cipolla is directed to computer that houses a camera. Murata teaches that a built-in light that turns on when a user moves the light from a stowed position. Assuming that Murata's camera is positioned into a bay of Cipolla's computer, ejection of the camera would not power-on the camera. A user would still be required to move the built-in light on the camera to activate the light of the camera. Further, the detection switch in Murata would not be in communication with the computer in Cipolla.

As a third factor, the differences between the claims and the applied references are great. Examples are provided above with respect to various claims and are not reiterated here.

As a fourth factor, the Examiner is performing an improper piecemeal construction that uses hindsight to arrive at the claim elements. In other words, the Examiner is picking and choosing unrelated and isolated sentences or teachings from Cipolla and Murata with hindsight of Appellants' invention to allegedly obviate the pending claims. One cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

As a fifth factor, Appellant argues that no teaching or suggestion exists to make the combination because the references are directed to solving completely different problems. As discussed in the background section, Cipolla is directed to providing a portable computer with a video camera. By contrast, the background section in Murata teaches problems associated with built-in lights in video cameras.

These various factors show that elements in the claims are not obvious in view of the Cipolla and Murata.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully request the Board of Appeals to reverse the Examiner's rejection of all pending claims.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529

VIII. Claims Appendix

1. A portable computer, comprising:

a base portion with a keyboard;

an electronic display connected to the base portion; and

a camera stored in the base portion of the portable computer, wherein the camera automatically powers on as the camera is ejected from the base portion of the portable computer.

2. The portable computer of claim 1 wherein the camera automatically powers off when inserted into the base portion.

3. The portable computer of claim 1 further comprising an elongated mounting member connected to the camera.

4. The portable computer of claim 3 wherein the mounting member has a cyclindrical shape and provides electrical communication between the camera and the base portion.

5. The portable computer of claim 1 further comprising a mounting member that mechanically and electrically couples the camera to the base portion.

6. The portable computer of claim 5, wherein one end of the camera is connected to the mounting member, the camera being movable about two different axes while connected to the mounting member.

7. The portable computer of claim 1 wherein the base portion comprises a cavity, and the camera is stored inside the cavity.

8. The portable computer of claim 7 wherein the cavity is formed in a side of the base portion.

9. The portable computer of claim 1 wherein:

the camera is movable between a storage position disposed inside the base portion and an ejected position disposed outside of the base portion, the camera being mechanically connected to the portable computer while in the ejected position; and

the camera is movable about two different axes while in the ejected position.

10. A method, comprising:

automatically powering a camera on while ejecting the camera from inside a cavity located in a computer; and

automatically powering the camera off while inserting the camera into the cavity of the computer.

11. The method of claim 9 further comprising activating a switch located inside the computer while ejecting the camera from the computer to perform said automatically powering the camera on.

12. The method of claim 11 further comprising activating the switch located inside the computer while inserting the camera into the computer to perform said automatically powering the camera off.

13. The method of claim 9 further comprising inserting said camera into a cavity in the computer so an outer surface of the camera forms an exterior surface of the computer.

14. The method of claim 9 further comprising removing the camera from mechanical attachment to the computer, and transmitting a wireless signal from the camera to the computer.

15. A video conference system, comprising:

a computer; and

a camera movable between a first position and a second position, wherein the camera is enclosed inside the computer in the first position and is ejected to be mechanically detached from the computer in the second position, the camera being electrically coupled to the computer in the second position, wherein the camera is in a power-off state while enclosed inside the computer in the first position and automatically transitions to a power-on state as the camera is ejected and physically moves from the first position inside the computer to the second position being mechanically detached from the computer.

16. The video conference system of claim 15 wherein the camera has a housing that is completely disposed inside a cavity in the computer in the first position such that the housing forms an exterior surface of the computer.

17. The video conference system of claim 15 wherein the camera transmits wireless signals to the computer while in the second position.

18. The video conference system of claim 15 wherein the computer further comprises a mounting member, wherein the mounting member is disposed inside the computer in the first position and extends outwardly from the computer in the second position.

19. The video conference system of claim 18 wherein the camera is mechanically connected to the mounting member while in the first position.

20. (canceled).

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.